

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,167	09/12/2003	Dmitry M. Smirnov	021756-017900US	7522
51206 TOWNSEND	7590 06/01/201 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAM	EXAMINER	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			GOFMAN, ALEX N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,-	2162		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/661,167	SMIRNOV ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
ALEX GOFMAN	2162					
	10/661,167 Examiner	10/661,167         SMIRNOV ET AL.           Examiner         Art Unit				

	ALEX GOFMAN	2162	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exh under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete.	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	M. O		DTOL OOA)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (i	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled</li> </ol>		imals filed amandmar	ot concelled the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii submitted in a separate, t	imely liled amendmen	it canceling the
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 32-42.44-48.50-52.55.56.59.60 and 65-	<u>68</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
/John Breene/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to arguments of Claim 32, the Applicant states that Lee does not disclose the newly added limitation "calling a dynamic function defined in the first compound transform definition, the dynamic function located elsewhere from the definition pointer position." The Examiner respectfully disagreectfully disagreectfully disagreectful with the control of the property of the p

The specification of the instant application [0042] states that "Dynamic functions are optionally configured to perform logic operations, external process calls, or other operations associated with a computer function and to transform payload Data 230 in response." This means that dynamic functions, as defined by the specification, is a call a function makes to a specification of that function.

Lee (0303, 0311 and 318) describes calling functions from at least "peripheral programs." This means that Lee discloses at least "external process calls," which is one of the definitions of the "dynamic functions" as described by the specification.
As such Lee discloses the above aroued limitation.